

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 14-22 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 14-22 have been added.

Priority

Applicants request acknowledgment of the claim for priority and acknowledgment of receipt of the priority document. The priority document (JP 2001-204668, dated July 5, 2001) was filed with the initial application on February 21, 2002 and is cited in the Official Filing Receipt of March 26, 2002.

35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sandridge et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,795,253). Claims 3, 6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandridge et al in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,082). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandridge et al. These rejections are traversed as follows.

The previously pending claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in favor of new claims 14-22. It is submitted that these new claims

patentably define the present invention over the cited art. The present invention is directed to a security terminal system for determining a kind or existence of a dangerous substance such as an explosive in a location such as an airport terminal or in the place where some event is taking place. In order to inspect the type or existence of this dangerous substance, the terminal system has a sampling means for sampling a substance to be inspected, means for analyzing the substance to be inspected, and a first determination means having a first standard data for determining the existence of the dangerous substance. If, upon a first determination, the existence of a dangerous substance is determined by comparing the analyzed data with standard data, a second analyzing process is performed and the results of the second analyzing process are transmitted to a support system. The support system has a second determination means with second standard data which performs a second determination to determine the kind and existence of the dangerous substance.

None of the cited references disclose these features of the presently claimed invention. For example, Sandridge et al disclose a remote sensing gas analyzer. However, this reference does not disclose the two-step analyzing in which a first determination is made followed by a second determination that has higher reliability than the first determination. The deficiencies in Sandridge et al are not overcome by resort to Wang et al. Indeed, the Examiner merely relies upon Wang et al for disclosing the conversion of spectral information of an FTIR spectrometer, mass

spectrometers or analytical X-ray instruments used to analyze and collect gases for display on a monitor. However, Wang et al do not disclose or suggest the use of a two-step analysis to determine the kind or existence of a dangerous substance. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By _____
Shrinath Malur
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120